

55.00 OP



INTRODUCTORY COMMENTS:

09/811,705

8/11/03

Because of the complexity and confusion of the history and development of prior art relating to aspheric mirrors, as applied to automotive vehicles, I conducted a research of said art class beginning with U.S. Patent # 1,784,710, December 9, 1930, V.E. Showalter's spherical convex mirror. Interestingly, it was more than forty years before this concept was applied to OEM vehicles in North America. This research reveals that **aspheric mirrors** first appeared upon the scene in the early 1960's. Prior art for aspheric mirrors continues to proliferate to this very day. And yet only two versions, of this entire "art class", have ever found their way onto vehicles in USA, Europe, or the rest of the world for that matter (there is a copy-cat version in China).

As we know, almost anything can be patented if it can be shown to be more or less "unique". It doesn't even have to work or be useful, just different and not "obvious". A prime example of this fact is my first patent issued on this subject, US #4,264,144, April 28, 1981. After I spent \$5,000 making a glass-bending mold, and made mirrors to that specification, I was shocked! The center part of the mirror worked fine, and the peripheral part of the mirror worked great also; but the transition portion between the two was an optical nightmare, which I at the time did not understand. Well, that's what the problem is with most of the ongoing Prior Art, in fact all of it that I've seen. I have personally developed, designed, had and have these mirrors manufactured to my specifications, and market/distribute these mirrors across USA and Canada since 1984, all under US patent #'s 4,449,786 and 5,980,050; and sundry other world wide patents. I have and am applying these aspheric mirrors to more **types** of automotive vehicles than any other person or entity on this globe. I can attest to the fact that most of the Prior Art out there is optically useless. Some of it is very deceptive: whereas statically it seems to perform satisfactorily, dynamically it becomes optically hopeless.

With the above introduction, this response readresses the issue of my confusion and concern with proclaiming Fig.1 and Fig.2 to represent two different species; whereas, in reality there is virtually no difference as to the process for their surface developments, since the **exact same formulas, variables, math sequences, and line-of-sight development are employed** for both alleged versions. The Fig.2 version is simply a central abutting of the Fig.1 LH and RH forms. Moreover, in my opinion, using these formulas and procedures, there is no way whatever that the version shown in Fig.2 may patent over the version shown in Fig.1. I'll further review this subject under REMARKS and CLAIMS.

RECEIVED
AUG 19 2003
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

ADDITIONAL PRIOR ART OF ONLY ASPHERIC MIRROR SYSTEMS: 09/811,705 8/11/03
(All of these concepts patented progressively with time over each other, and not a single one has
ever commercially seen the light of day, because they simply are not practical optical solutions)

<u>COUNTRY</u>	<u>PAT NO.</u>	<u>DATE</u>	<u>INVENTOR</u>
USA	3,003,396	OCT 10, 1961	JENKINS
BELGUM	653.831	OCT 1, 1964	DEVOS
FRANCE	1.420.532	NOV 2, 1965	CITROEN
GERMANY	1939756	FEB 25, 1971	BLAKE
GERMANY	1947956	APR 15, 1971	GREBE
GERMANY	2054396	MAY 4, 1972	CONNOR
GERMANY	1,279,158	JUN 28, 1972	HACKER
USA	4,012,125	MAR 15, 1977	HART
FRANCE	FR2420-452	OCT 19, 1979	VARNIER
JAPAN	855-51635	APR 15, 1980	MATSUO & YOSHIHARA
USA	4,258,979	MAR 31, 1981	MAHIN
USA	4,264,144	APR 28, 1981	McCORD
USA	4,331,382	MAY 25, 1982	GRAFF